

REMARKS

Claims 56-59, 61, 63-65 and 67-69 are pending. The amendments introduce no new matter. Provision for extension of time accompanies this response.

5 The Office's attention is directed to commonly owned copending applications for consideration of any matter, e.g., double patenting, that may be considered germane to the prosecution of the claims in this application. The publication numbers for those applications are US 2005/0101581 A1, US 2005/0159366 A1, US 2005/0075321 A1, US 2004/0043973 A1, US
10 2004/0116359 A1, US 2004/0138187 A1, US 2004/00220161 A1, US 2004/0220114 A1, US 2004/0242618 A1, US 2004/0097406 A1, US 2003/0083231 A1 and US 2003/0060425 A1.

35 USC § 112, first paragraph

15 The Office rejected claims 56-59, 61, 63-65 and 67-69 under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph as allegedly not enabled.

 The Office noted that the variable group substituents include polymers. The amended claims do not recite polymers as variable group substituents and this basis for the rejection is moot.

20 The Office noted that the term "substituted" could include many substituents. Applicants have amended the claims to incorporate into independent claim 56 the definition for substituted at the paragraph bridging pages 16 and 17. In view of the amendment, this basis for the rejection is moot.

 Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the
25 rejection.

35 USC § 112, second paragraph

 The Office rejected claims 56-59, 61, 63-65 and 67-69 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph as indefinite because the term R^{PR} was not defined. The
30 amended claims define R^{PR} and this basis for the rejection is moot.

The Office asserted that there was no antecedent basis in claim 59 for some substituted alkyl R²⁵ moieties recited in claim 65. Applicants believe that antecedent basis is present because claim 59 depends on intervening claims 57 and 58 on independent claim 56. Claim 56 defines R²⁵ as -H or optionally substituted alkyl so the antecedent basis for the optionally substituted alkyl moieties in claim 65 is present in claim 56. Applicants believe that the -CH₂OH, -CH₂OC(O)CH₃, -OC(O)CH₃ and -CH₂OC(O)OCH₃ moieties that claim 65 recites for R²⁵ are all within the definition of substituted alkyl that amended claim 56 recites. Applicants request clarification of this issue if the Office maintains this objection.

The Office noted that claims 56 and 58 were duplicates because the two structures were the same. Claims 57 and 58 were duplicates. Applicants have amended the structure of claim 58 to differ from the structure in claim 56 and the basis for this objection is moot.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that all of the issues the Office raised in the office action mailed on May 27, 2005 are now obviated and that the claims are in condition for allowance.

Hollis-Eden Pharmaceuticals, Inc.,

Date: October 26, 2005



Daryl D. Muenchau, Reg. No. 36,616
Hollis-Eden Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
4435 Eastgate Mall, Suite 400
San Diego, CA 92121
Phone: 858-320-2569
Fax: 858-558-6470